

REMARKS

Claims 1-10, 12-20, 22-41, 48-59 and 64-66 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 17, 22, 23 and 64 being independent. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 12-17, 22-32, 34, 36-41, 48-53 and 55 have been amended; claim 11 has been canceled; and claims 64-66 have been added. No new matter has been added.

Independent claims 1, 17, 22 and 23, along with their dependent claims 2-16, 18-20, 24-41 and 48-63, have been rejected as being anticipated by Stasnick (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,264).

Each of independent claims 1, 17 and 22 recites a client that includes a browser application configured to render data written in Hyper-Text Markup Language (HTML). At the client, multiple openings of the browser application are simultaneously executed in response to electronic data received from a host by simultaneously launching the browser application multiple times. At least one opening of the browser application is configured to exchange messages with at least one other opening of the browser application. The messages are exchanged through a communications pathway between the at least one opening of the browser application and the at least one other opening of the browser application. The communications pathway is established and located entirely at the client. Each of the multiple openings of the browser application are configured to render data written in HTML. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 17 and 22, and their dependent claims, because Stasnick does not describe or suggest simultaneously executing multiple openings of the same browser application, each opening being configured to render data written in HTML, by simultaneously launching the same browser application multiple times in response to data received from a host.

As stated in the response to the Office Action of April 6, 2006, Stasnick describes a multiple-browser application 402 that allows a user to access and interact with multiple applications, including browser applications, using a single integrated user interface (col. 7, lines 18-39). Stasnick's multiple-browser application 402 may interact with a network operations center 150 or with a proxy server within a local area network 120 to manage multiple browsers and applications accessed by the user (col. 6, lines 32-37). Upon a user signing on to Stasnick's

system, client configuration settings, which indicate the applications that the user is allowed or denied access, are loaded into client configuration RAM 404 of the client 160 (col. 8, lines 49-57).

After the user signs on and the client configuration is set, the multiple-browser application 402 waits for user input before launching any applications (col. 8, lines 65-67). Only upon a user requesting that an application be launched through interactions with GUI 500 does the multiple-browser application 402 launch an application (col. 8, line 66 to col. 9, line 7 and col. 9, lines 13-16). Accordingly, Stasnick does not describe or suggest simultaneously executing multiple openings of the same browser application in response to data received from a host by simultaneously launching the same browser application multiple times. Rather, as shown in Fig. 6, Stasnick describes launching applications through the multiple-browser application 402 sequentially and in response to user requests, not simultaneously and in response to data received from a host.

In responding to the Final Office Action, applicants asserted that they did not fully understand the Examiner's arguments in the Final Office Action and respectfully requested clarification. In particular, applicants respectfully requested that the Examiner clarify, in the advisory action, the following: (1) what element described or suggested in Stasnick is being equated to an "instantiation of the browser application"; (2) where Stasnick describes or suggests that multiple of these elements are simultaneously executed in response to electronic data received from a host; and (3) where Stasnick describes or suggests that at least one of these multiple elements is able to exchange messages with at least one other of these multiple elements.

The advisory action of January 22, 2007 was helpful in shedding some light as to how the Examiner is interpreting Stasnick. The advisory action stated:

Applicants argue that Stasnick does not describe or suggest that multiple instantiations of browser application are executed simultaneously in response to electronic data received from a host wherein at least one instantiation of the browser is configured to exchange messages with at least one other instantiation of the browser application. However, the Examiner disagrees. Stasnick discloses a multi-browser client architecture for managing multiple applications having a history list. The multiple browser windows contains a number of content windows accessed by the user. Stasnick discloses multiple instantiations such as toolbar, channel buttons, etc. that communicates with each other once the user click on a particular feature of the web page (see Figures 5 and 6, col. 8, lines 20-37, lines 65-67 and col. 9, lines 1-24). By

giving the broadest reasonable interpretation, Stasnick does teach multiple instantiations of browser application are executed simultaneously in response to electronic data received from a host wherein at least one other instantiation of the browser is configured to exchange messages with at least one other instantiation of the browser application.

(emphasis added). As best understood, the Examiner is apparently equating the toolbar and channel buttons of the multiple-browser application 402 with instantiations or openings of the multiple-browser application 402. The toolbar and channel buttons, however, are not separate openings of the browser application 402. Rather, they are graphical user interface elements that are presented in the GUI of the multiple-browser application 402. Moreover, the toolbar and channel buttons are not themselves configured to display data written in HTML. Rather, it is the browser applications managed by the multiple-browser application 402 that are configured to render data written in HTML. Applicants further note that Stasnick does not describe or suggest any application whatsoever that is launched multiple times simultaneously, much less a browser application configured to render data written in HTML that is launched multiple times simultaneously in response to data received from a host, as claimed. Accordingly, applicants again submit that Stasnick's system fails to satisfy the limitation of simultaneously executing multiple openings of the same browser application, each opening being configured to render data written in HTML, by simultaneously launching the same browser application multiple times in response to data received from a host.

For at least these reasons, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 17 and 22, and their dependent claims 2-16, 18-20, 24-41, 48-53, 56-58 and 60-62.

Independent claim 23 recites, among other features, transmitting electronic data from the host in response to a data request received from the client, wherein the electronic data comprises instructions for simultaneously executing multiple openings of the browser application, each opening being configured to render data written in HTML, by simultaneously launching the browser application multiple times, at least one opening of the browser application being configured to exchange messages with at least one other opening of the browser application. For at least the reasons described above, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 and its dependent claims 54, 55, 59 and 63.

New claims 64-66 have been added, including new independent claim 64. Independent claim 64 recites establishing a connection between a client and a host. The client includes a browser application configured to render data written in HTML format. Electronic data is received from the host in response to a data request transmitted from the client. At the client, a first opening of the browser application is executed in response to electronic data received from the host by launching the browser application a first time. A first HTML document is rendered using the first opening of the browser application. At the client, a second opening of the browser application is executed using the first opening of the browser application by launching the browser application a second time. A second HTML document is rendered using the second opening of the browser application. At the client system, the first opening of the browser application directly communicates a message to the second opening of the browser application. A third HTML document is rendered using the second opening of the browser application in response to the message and subsequent to the rendering of the second HTML document.

Applicants submit that claim 64, and its dependent claims 65 and 66, are patentable over the cited art at least because the cited art does not describe intercommunicating openings of the same browser application that are able to send messages directly to each other at the client system and render HTML documents in response to the messages, as claimed. Notably, while Stasnick's multiple-browser application 402 might be able to communicate with the browser applications it manages, Stasnick's multiple-browser application 402 is not the same application as the browser applications it manages and, therefore, may not be properly characterized as either of the recited intercommunicating first and second openings of the same browser application. Moreover, Stasnick provides no description or suggestion that the browser applications managed by the multiple-browser application 402 are able to directly exchange messages with each other at the client system and render HTML documents in response to messages received from each other.

Applicants do not acquiesce in the Examiner's characterizations of the art. For brevity and to advance prosecution, however, applicants may have not addressed all characterizations of the art and reserve the right to do so in further prosecution of this or a subsequent application.

The absence of an explicit response by the applicants to any of the examiner's positions does not constitute a concession of the examiner's positions. The fact that applicant's comments have focused on particular arguments does not constitute a concession that there are not other arguments for patentability of the claims. All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons given with respect to the claims on which they depend.

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The fee in the amount of \$450 in payment of a two-month extension of time fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,



Roberto J. Devoto
Reg. No. 55,108

Date: March 22, 2007

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331